DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 085 622 CG 008 542

AUTHOR Hart, Roland J.
TITLE Evaluative and Aggressive Reactions to Over-Evaluating Oneself and Under-Evaluating Others.
PUB DATE Aug 73
NOTE 28p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS *Aggression; Behavior Patterns; College Students; Conflict; Evaluation; Interpersonal Relationship; *Norms; *Resource Allocations; *Self Evaluation; *Social Exchange Theory; Speeches

ABSTRACT

This paper tries to demonstrate the existence of social norms against self-evaluations that are more favorable than people deserve (over-evaluation of self) and evaluations of others that are less favorable than others deserve (under-evaluation of others). The norms are derived from a resource theory in which these norms are needed to protect against the conflict that follows from people attempting to get ahead of others in acquiring scarce interpersonal resources. In an interpersonal exchange situation, persons who violated the above norms were evaluated less favorably by subjects and were attributed more responsibility for a negative event than non-norms violators. Surprisingly, subjects (1) failed to aggress against unfavorably evaluated norm violators, and (2) evaluated aggressive persons as favorably as nonaggressive ones. Implications of the findings for the interpersonal evaluation and social protest situations are discussed. (Author)

FILMED FROM BEST AVAILABLE COPY

ED 085622

Evaluative and Aggressive Reactions to Over-Evaluating Oneself and Under-Evaluating Others

Roland J. Hart

Brigham Young University[1]

Running Title: Over- and Under-Evaluation

Mailing Address: Roland Hart
1006 Harvard Street
Rochester, New York 14610

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CG 008 542

[1]Currently at the University of Rochester

Evaluative and Aggressive Reactions to Over-Evaluating Oneself and Under-Evaluating Others

Abstract

This paper trys to demonstrate the existence of social norms against self-evaluations that are more favorable than people deserve (over-evaluation of self) and evaluations of others that are less favorable than others deserve (under-evaluation of others). The norms are derived from a resource theory in which these norms are needed to protect against the conflict that follows from people attempting to get ahead of others in acquiring scarce interpersonal resources. In an interpersonal exchange situation, persons who violated the above norms were evaluated less favorably by subjects and were attributed more responsibility for a negative event than non-norms violators. Surprisingly, subjects (1) failed to aggress against unfavorably evaluated norm violators, and (2) evaluated aggressive persons as favorably as non-aggressive ones. Implications of the findings for interpersonal evaluation and social protest situations are discussed.

Evaluative and Aggressive Reactions to Over-Evaluating Oneself and Under-Evaluating Others

This paper proposes that there are social norms against a person over-evaluating himself (e.g. evaluating himself more favorably than he deserves according to some social criteria) and under-evaluating others. Violation of the above norms leads to negative evaluation of the norm violator.

The way in which the above norms are thought to originate is outlined below. In resource theory (Foa, 1971), such interpersonal attributes as status and love are treated like resources that can be exhanged in the same context with such economic resources as money and goods. If interpersonal attributes like status and love can be treated as resources, then the scarcity or abundance of these resources should affect the way in which these resources are exchanged, just as scarcity or abundance affects the exchange of economic resources.

When resources are limited and scarce, conflict over the destribution of these scarce resources arises, since people wish to get ahead of others in acquiring the limited resources. Conflict over who should receive the greatest quantity of resources can be solved by referring to a public "evaluation dimension", a dimension on which differential levels of value are attributed to people, and deciding to distribute resources according to levels of value on the dimension with highly evlauated persons receiving the most resources. Levels of value on a dimension are determined by definitions of authority figures and social consensus about the extent to which a person conforms to simple, objective standards. The standards might be of a religious, social, economic, academic, etc., nature.

Conflict over who should receive the greatest quantity of resources can only be solved if the following kind of agreement on an evaluation dimension occurs: the favorableness of a person's self-evaluation has to agree with how favorably others evaluate him, and how favorably he evaluates those others has to agree with the favorableness of their self-evaluations. Over-evaluation of self and under-evaluation of others relative to defined levels of value on an evaluation dimension is indicative of a self-centered motivation to get ahead of others and a motivation to provoke conflict. Even so, these kinds of evaluations should occur fairly often when resources are scarce and the desire to acquire increased resources is at a high level. Holmes (1967) describes the conflicts in a university seminar setting that result when participants appear to "over-evaluate" themselves or "under-evaluate" others. In order to control these kinds of evaluations, social norms are created against self-evaluations that are more favorable and evaluations of others that are less favorable than the socially defined levels. By way of contrast, under-evaluation of self and over-evaluation of others is not indicative of a self-centered motivation to get ahead of others or a motivation to provoke conflict and would not be expected to occur often when the desire to acquire scarce resources is at a high level, so norms against these kinds of evaluation are not expected. However, if over-evaluation of others appears to encourage others to violate the norm against over-evaluation of self, over-evaluation of others in this case may itself become a norm violation.

When interpersonal resources are abundant rather than scarce, the norm against over-evaluation of self is supposed to be relaxed. With abundance, conflict over the distribution of resources can be solved with the creation of a positive equality norm in which everyone receives a

positive and equal amount of a resource. The norm against over-evaluation of self is relaxed so those who are less favorably evaluated can raise their self-evaluations to positive and equal levels. The positive equality norm is similar to the "I'm OK, You're OK" position of Transactional Analysis (Harris, 1967). In attempting to increase the self-esteem of inner-city children Felker (1972) evoked a positive equality norm by getting teachers and students to publically attribute positive value to themselves and others. When interpersonal resources were abundant in this way, the norm against over-evaluation of self was relaxed, and the children's self-esteem improved. "Unconditional positive regard" (Rogers, 1961) is an ideal when the positive equality norm is operating since everyone is supposed to receive a favorable evaluation whether they conform well to the evaluation dimension standards or not.

The existence of a norm against under-evaluation of others is implied by data from a number of studies. When someone receives an unfavorable evaluation, he usually feels under-evaluated and evaluates the other person unfavorably in return (see Harvey et al., 1957; Byrne, & Griffitt, 1966). However, someone who evaluates himself very unfavorably does not feel under-evaluated when he receives unfavorable evaluations, so he should return favorable evaluations to those who evaluate him unfavorably. Deutsch and Solomon (1959) reported that after receiving an unfavorable evaluation, subjects returned very unfavorable evaluations to the evaluator when they thought well of themselves, but returned fairly favorable, nonrecipocal evaluations when they thought poorly of themselves. Subjects presumably felt under-evaluated in the first instance but not in the second. If there is no norm against over-evaluation of others then a person with an unfavorable self-evaluation should respond relatively favorably to

everyone, both to those who over-evaluate him with a favorable evaluation and those who "realistically" evaluate him unfavorably. The data of Weist (1965) and Deutsch and Solomon (1959) are consistent with this expectation. If a norm against under-evaluation of others exists but one against over-evaluation of others does not, subjects should respond more favorably to someone who over-evaluates rather than under-evaluates them, as Steiner (1968) found. Subjects seemed to recognize violating a norm when they over-compensated in a favorable direction after inadvertently under-evaluating someone (Walster, Walster, Abrahms, & Brown, 1966).

The existance of a norm against over-evaluation of self is implied by data from a number of studies. Pepitone (1964) found observers lowered their evaluations of a person who over-evaluated his own status, while they often raised their evaluations of someone who under-evaluated his own status, suggesting the existence of a norm against over-evaluation of self and perhaps a norm favoring at times, but certainly not opposing, under-evaluation of self. Steiner (1968) reported subjects were more receptive to favorable than unfavorable information about themselves, while Eagly (1967) found subjects more receptive to favorable information about themselves than about others. This is expected when resources appear scarce and people want to improve their own evaluation compared to others. However, when someone anticipates a future evaluation, he faces the prospect of over-evaluating himself. When subjects risked over-evaluating themselves in this way they were not receptive to favorable information about themselves (Eagly & Acksen, 1971), and they evaluated the one who over-evaluated them unfavorably (Jones & Pines, 1968; Jones & Ratner, 1967). Someone who over-evaluates another in this kind of situation probably appears to be inappropriately encouraging another to violate the norm against over-evaluating himself.

If over-evaluation of self and under-evaluation of others do in fact violate norms then norm violators should not only be (1) evaluated less favorably but also (2) held more responsible for negative events produced by their actions, and (3) given more physically aggressive "punishment" or "correction". The prediction in Hypothesis 3 above of greater aggressiveness toward norm violators is supported by data showing more physical aggressiveness toward an instigator who either under-evaluated subjects intelligence (Geen, 1968) or under-evaluated outcomes competent subject's felt they deserved (Ross, Thibaut & Evenbeck, 1971).

Differential attribution of responsibility for a negative event has negative consequences for group functioning (Shaw & Breed, 1970; Shaw & Tremble, 1971) and has been related to the extent an event is both foreseeable and intentionally produced (Heider, 1958; Shaw and Sulzer, 1964). Hypothesis 2 above suggests a relationship between responsibility attribution and norm violation. If the world is a "just world" (Lerner & Mathews, 1967) and people should get what they deserve according to evaluation dimension standards, more responsibility should be attributed to the norm violator than non-norm-violator who produces a negative event.

Method

Procedure

Male introductory psychology students volunteered as subjects to fill a class requirement for participation. An "impression formation" experiment was conducted with previously unacquainted randomly paired subjects. As a means to create an initial standard impression of their partner in the experiment, the two subjects wrote out answers to five

questions in separate rooms. They expected to exchange answers with their partner. They described what was on their mind most both (1) recently and (2) during their free time, as well as (3) what was important to them and what made them (4) happy and (5) angry. All subjects based their initial impressions of their partner on a standard set of answers with a few positive self-references ostensibly written by the partner. The standard answers indicated the partner felt he didn't study enough, and didn't have enough money, liked being alone at times, and was hasseled at times by his parents in high school.

Subjects met next in a common room for a short instuction period in which an exchange situation that was going to follow was described. A relevant evaluation dimension was created by telling subjects indicies of their likeability were needed. Each subject had 10 identical notes to exchange in turn with his partner. Each note contained a place for subjects to rate how much they liked themselves and their partner on 10-point scales. As explained on an instruction sheet the object of sending and receiving notes in turn was to reach the following kind of agreement on a given pair of notes: How much the subject liked himself had to agree with how much the partner liked the subject, and how much the subject liked the partner had to agree with how much the partner liked himself. The point of agreement between one person's self-liking and another persons liking for him was ostensibly a good index of likeability. Subjects were told that they should try to be honest as well as try to agree.

The opportunity for physical aggressiveness was created by asking subjects to indicate one of six levels of electric shock on each note ranging from level "1" (no shock) to level "6" (extremely painful shock).

Subjects were told, "the purpose of the shock is to influence the other person to agree with you." Subjects could avoid receiving any shock that might be indicated on one of their partner's notes by agreeing with this note in the manner described above. Actual delivery of the shocks was to be delayed until after exchanging the 10 notes, at which time subjects could deliver up to 10 shocks to each other depending on the number of shocks indicated on the notes. Realism was increased by having subjects "calibrate" a shock apparatus by delivering slightly "painful" shocks to each other during the instruction period. The experiment ended before any shocks on the notes were actually delivered.

After the instuction period subjects went to their separate rooms to exchange notes. The pattern of ratings on the partners' notes was programmed by the experimenter to create the independent variables described in the design section. Each subjects sent the "first" note and then responded in turn with their next note to the note they received from the partner. In order to get an index of subjects agreement with the partner, the partner never agreed with the subject until the subject agreed first. Subjects who agreed before exhanging all 10 notes continued to exchange the remainder of the notes to see if they could "continue to agree". If they couldn't agree on the first 10 notes subjects expected to exchange 10 more after the shock period.

Immediately after the note exchange just before the anticipated delivery of shock, subjects rated themselves and their partner on 10-point scales on the dependent variables listed in Table 1. Four measures of interpersonal attraction, three evaluative semantic differential items (Osgood, 1957), and the attributes kind, unselfish, tolerant, just, polite, and moral were included as multiple measures of a primary, undimensional, evaluative

dependent variable. Evaluation semantic differential items and the attributes just mentioned have been shown by Kuusinen (1969) to be related. Activity and potency semantic differential items were also included along with several other attributes.

Design

A 2 x 4 factorial design with 15 subjects per cell was created when the experimenter varied the ratings subjects received on the partners' notes in the following standard ways: (1) a shock-factor was created with some subjects receiving (a) high shock and others (b) low shock; (2) a norm factor was creased by having some subjects interact with either a (a) "positive equality" partner who liked himself and the subject, or (b) an "underdog" partner who disliked himself and liked the subject, or (c) an "alienated" partner who disliked himself and the subject, or (d) a "self-seeking" partner who liked himself and disliked the subject. The like ratings on partners' notes averaged 2.5 while dislike ratings averaged 7.5 over the 10 notes. High shock ratings averaged 3.5 (moderately painful-painful) while low shock ratings averaged 1.2 (practically no shock). All subjects were assigned to treatment conditions independently of the subject they were paired with to avoid confounding the experiment session, including the instruction period with treatment conditions.

Hypotheses

Subjects were expected to like themselves and initially like the partner at least moderately well. The positive equality partner violated no norms and conveyed the idea of abundance with the ratings on his notes so he should be evaluated favorably by subjects. The underdog partner under-evaluated himself. He should be evaluated as favorably as the positive

equality partner if there is no norm against under-evaluation of self. The alientated partner under-evaluates both himself and the subject, but violates a norm only by under-evaluating the subject. The self-seeking partner also under-evaluates the subject. The self-seeking and alienated partners should be evaluated less favorably than the underdog and positive equality partners if a norm exists against under-evaluation of others. As subjects' evaluations of the self-seeking partner go down, he appears to be over-evaluating himself as well as under-evaluating others while the alienated partner only under-evaluates others. The self-seeking partner should be evaluated less favorably than the alienated partner if a norm exists against over-evaluation of self as well as against under-evaluation of others. The pattern of evaluations predicted by Hypothesis 1 is summarized as follows: (a) the underdog should be evaluated as favorably as the positive equality partner; (b) the self-seeking and alienated partners should be evaluated less favorably than the underdog and positive equality partners; (c) the self-seeking partner should be evaluated less favorably than the alienated partner. Hypotheses 2 and 3 predict the same pattern described above for responsibility and shock ratings, with the positive equality and underdog partners thought least responsible for a negative event and given least shock and the self-seeking partner thought most responsible and given most shock.

With the inclusion of the shock factor two more hypotheses can be added as follows: The high-shock partner should (4) receive more shock and (5) should be evaluated less favorably than the low-shock partner.

Hypotheses 4 and 5 are supported by data showing interaction with an aggressive person provokes increased aggressiveness in return and results in a less favorable evaluation of the aggressor (Taylor, 1967; Pisano & Taylor, 1971; Hendrick & Taylor, 1971).

Results

Subjects ratings on the initial note of the exchange were made before receiving any notes from the partner. In Shock X Norm analyses of variance there were no initial differences between either shock or norm treatment conditions on either subjects' liking for themselves or their partner or on the initial amount of shock given the partner. None of the F ratios approached significance. This indicates that demand characteristics that might have been present during the instruction period before the note exchange did not create in an initial difference in interpersonal attraction or aggressiveness between conditions. Subjects initially liked both themselves 2.8 (1=like) and their partner 3.8, as was expected in deriving the pattern of over- and under-evaluations for Hypothesis 1.

Hypothesis 1 Evaluation

A factor analyses of subjects' ratings of the partner was computed (by correlating the dependent variables across the 120 subjects) in order to see if some of the variables could be considered multiple measures of a undimensional, evaluative dependent variable. Table 1 shows the factor matrix after a varimax rotation of the first two factors. A third factor was excluded from rotation because it accounted for only 6% of the variance.

Insert Table 1 about here

To identify the factors they have been labelled evaluation and potency following Osgood (1957), even though the potency factor includes active and might be considered a combined activity-potency factor. The two factors could also be conceptualized as love-hostility and dominance-submission dimensions (Foa, 1961). Factor scores were computed from the rotated matrix to provide composite measures of subjects' evaluations of the partner.

According to the first hypothesis the norm violating partners should be evaluated unfavorably. The pattern of evaluations predicted by Hypothesis 1 was tested by planned comparisons between norm factor conditions using evaluation factor scores. The mean evaluation factor scores for the four norm conditions were positive equality, .67; underdog, .55; alienated, -.22; and self-seeking, -.99. As expected a planned comparison of positive equality and underdog conditions was not significant ($F < 1$) indicating the underdog was evaluated as favorably as the positive equality partner. A planned comparison of the self-seeking and alienation with the underdog and positive equality conditions shows the self-seeking and alienated partners were evaluated less favorably than the other two partners as expected ($F = 80.6$, $p < .001$). A planned comparison of the self-seeking and alientation conditions was significant as expected ($F = 16.3$, $p < .001$) and shows that the self-seeking partner was evaluated less favorably than the alienated partner. Using the method outlined by Vaughan & Corballes (1969), the latter two planned comparisons explained, respectively, 37% and 7% of the total variance in evaluation factor scores. The pattern of evaluations predicted by Hypothesis 1 was found in all separate Shock X Norm analyses of variance on individual evaluation attributes.

Hypothesis 2 Responsibility

Disagreement during the note exchange can be considered a negative event for subjects. Disagreement was extensive in all norm conditions except the positive equality condition. The percentage of the 30 subjects in each norm condition who agreed with one or more of the partners notes was positive equality, 87%; underdog, 27%; alienated, 13%; and self-seeking, 3% ($\chi^2 = 57.2$, $p < .001$). On the final questionnaire subjects estimated the level of agreement or disagreement that occurred during the note exchange and then rated how responsible both they and their partner were for the previously indicated level of agreement. The positive equality condition was excluded from the present analysis since there was little disagreement and therefore no negative event in this condition. Subjects perceived a high level of disagreement with the partner in the other three conditions. The level of disagreement averaged 9.2 on a 10-point scale and did not differ between the three conditions ($F < 1$).

Responsibility attributed to the partner was compared with the responsibility subjects attributed to themselves using a repeated measures self-partner factor. A Self-partner X Norn X Shock analysis of variance on responsibility ratings showed a significant Self-partner X Norm interaction ($F = 7.0$, $p < .01$). The nature of this interaction is shown by the Self-partner X Norm means and simple effects in Table 2. As anticipated

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

by Hypothesis 2 the self-seeking partner was thought most and the underdog partner least responsible for disagreement. Subjects felt themselves less responsible than the self-seeking partner for the disagreement that

occurred while subjects felt as responsible as the partner in the other two conditions. The feeling that the alienated partner had personal problems may have been one reason why this partner was not thought more responsible than he was. Some subjects suggested he needed some professional counseling.

Hypotheses 3-5 Aggressiveness

Hypothesis 3 predicts subjects should be more aggressive toward norm violating partners. The dependent variable for shock ratings was the average amount of shock given the partner on the notes before subjects agreed, if they did, with the partner. The rationale for using the shock was to obtain agreement and the meaning of the shock changed after agreement occurred. A Shock X Norm analysis of variance was computed on these shock ratings. Hypothesis 3 predicts a norm main effect with subjects more aggressive toward norm violating partners but this main effect was not significant ($F < 1$).

As predicted by Hypothesis 4 the shock main effect from the above analysis was highly significant ($F = 73.5$, $p < .001$), explaining 38% of the total variance in shock ratings. This main effect shows the high-shock partner who provoked aggressiveness received more shock in return than the low-shock partner. The high-shock partner received a mean shock level of 2.8 compared to 1.5 for the low-shock partner. During the note exchange high shock ratings at the levels given by the partner had no real instrumental value for forcing subjects to agree with the partner since approximately 33% of the subjects agreed with one or more of his notes in both the high and low shock conditions.

Hypothesis 5 predicts the aggressive high-shock partner should be evaluated less favorably than the low-shock partner. However, the shock main effect from a Shock X Norm analysis of variance on evaluation factor scores was not significant ($F = 1.6$), meaning the high-shock pattner was evaluated as favorably as the low-shock partner.

Other Evaluations

While under-evaluation of self was not rated unfavorably with evaluation factor scores, it was rated slightly less favorably with potency factor scores, particularly so on the potency attribute confident. The underdog and alienated partners who under-evaluated themselves were thought slightly less potent ($F = 4.3$, $p < .01$, explained variance = 8%) and less confident ($F = 18.9$, $p < .001$) than the other two partners. The F ratios are norm main effects from Shock x Norm analyses of variance. The means for the attribute confident were positive equality, 3.7; underdog, 7.0; alienated, 6.8; and self-seeker, 4.3.

Confidence (potency) was disliked when it was associated with over-evaluation of self. The self-seeking partner was confident but he also over-evaluated himself. He was evaluated less favorably on evaluation factor scores than the unconfident alienated partner who under-evaluated himself.

The positive equality partner initially over-evaluated himself slightly since he liked himself an average of 2.5 on 10 notes while subjects liked him only 3.6 on the initial note. In spite of this slight initial norm violation, subjects' liking for the positive equality partner increased from 3.6 on the intial note to 2.9 on the final questionnaire ($F = 8.4$, $p < .01$). The latter rating was made after the note exchange. By way of contrast, the underdog partner was not liked more ($F = 3.0$, n.s.) and the alienated and self-seeking partners were liked less ($F = 7.2$, $p < .05$; $F = 14.8$, $p < .001$, respectively). The norm against over-evaluation of self seems to have been relaxed for the positive equality partner. Abundance in this condition is supposed to make this norm unnecessary.

Subjects evaluated the alienated and self-seeking partners less favorably than themselves, both during and after the note exchange, while subjects rated the positive equality and underdog partners as favorably as themselves after the exchange on the final questionnaire. In the alienation and self-seeking conditions, all F ratios comparing self-ratings with ratings of the partner were significant beyond the $p < .02$ level. When attributing selfishness to themselves, subjects in the alienated and self-seeking conditions thought themselves more selfish than subjects in the other two conditions did. Unselfish self-ratings were positive equality, 4.2; underdog, 4.2; alienated, 5.8; self-seeking, 5.1 ($F = 6.3$, $p < .001$). Subjects in the alienated and self-seeking conditions may have recognized violating a positive equality norm by rating their partner less favorably than themselves and in consequence thought themselves more selfish than did the subjects who rated their partner as favorably as themselves.

Discussion

The pattern of evaluation factor ratings support the conclusion that norms against over-evaluation of self and under-evaluation of others exist. The alienated and self-seeking partners violated norms and were evaluated less favorably than non-norm violators. Under-evaluation of self was not expected to violate any norm and the underdog partner who did so was evaluated favorably. The self-seeking partner who over-evaluated himself was evaluated less favorably than the alienated partner who did not. Simple reciprocity is not an adequate alternative explanation for the pattern of evaluation ratings, since if subjects did nothing more than reciprocate their partner's ratings the self-seeking and alienated partners should have been rated equally unfavorably. A balance theory

(e.g. Heider, 1958) is not an adequate alternative explanation either, since a balance theory would probably predict the level of agreement with partner's notes during the note exchange would produce the pattern of evaluation ratings. As noted previously, there were very different levels of agreement with the positive equality and underdog partners (87% versus 27%, respectively; $\chi^2 = 27.5$; $p < .001$), but these two partners were evaluated equally favorably. The levels of agreement with the underdog, alienated and self-seeking partners were all low, but the underdog partner was evaluated much more favorably than the latter two partners. Levels of agreement per se cannot account for the pattern of evaluation ratings. The most responsibility for disagreement was attributed to the self-seeking partner who violated both norms, which again suggests the above norms do in fact exist.

Two unexpected results were found: 1) While subjects did evaluate norm violators less favorably they were not more aggressive toward violators, and 2) subjects liked the aggressvie partner as well as the nonaggressive partner. The unfavorable evaluation of norm violation should not lead to increased aggressiveness if interpersonal attraction does not mediate physical aggressiveness. Baron (1971) and Hendrick and Taylor (1971) have found aggressiveness to be independent of interpersonal attraction produced attitudinal similarity, however, the data of Geen (1968) and Ross et al. (1971) imply that under-evaluation of others can result in increased aggressiveness toward the under-evaluator.

A resolution might be found by assuming love and physical aggressiveness are dissimilar interpersonal resources as Foa's (1971) data imply they are. After receiving a resource, Foa has shown that a preference exists

for returning similar rather than dissimilar resources. In the present experiment subjects returned the same rather than dissimilar resources (e.g. shock rating for shock rating and like-dislike evaluation for like-dislike evaulation, rather than shock for evaluation or evaluation for shock). Foa suggests dissimilar resources will be returned at increased levels when the same or similar resources do not seem to be available to return. Physical aggressiveness toward someone who over-evaluates himself and under-evaluates others might occur when a structured means of returning evaluations does not seem to be available but a structued means of aggressing does.

It seems apparent than an aggressor is often disliked (e.g. Hendrick & Taylor, 1971), but in the present experiment he was not. People may be less concerned with aggression per se than with the violation of norms that can sometimes be implied by the use of aggression. The aggressor may be evaluated unfavorably because it is assumed he is over-evaluating himself and under-evaluating those he is aggressing against. In the present experiment the norm violations were explicitly defined by the two evaluations that accompanied the shock rather than by the shock itself, so in this case the shock conveyed no meaning about norm violations independent of the two evaluations. Partners were liked or disliked depending on whether or not the two evaluations violated norms, and since the shock did not convey information about norm violations shock did not influence attraction. By extending this rationale about how aggressiveness influences attraction to attitudinal similarity, Hart and Warnick (1973) found that attitudinal similarity did not influence interpersonal attraction once norm violation or nonviolation was specified. Subjects assumed a dissimilar person would under-evaluate them and over-evaluate himself, but when he did not he was liked as well as a similar person.

Social stability and protest in black communities in the 1960's will now be examined briefly to illustrate a possible application of these norms to intergroup relations. Historically, in the U.S. whites have evaluated themselves favorably as a group and blacks unfavorably, while blacks were initially forced to accept an unfavorable self-evaluation and a favorable evaluation of whites. Once an unfavorable self-evaluation and a favorable evlauation of whites is established these evaluations tend to become self-perpetuating. If a black liked himself more and whites less, he would then be over-evaluating himself and under-evaluating the white group, and violation of these norms would provoke a negative reaction from whites and lower the blacks self-evaluation even further. A desire to avoid violating these norms can help explain why a minority group can receive poor treatment for a long period of time without protesting. By way of contrast, whites could evaluate themselves favorably and blacks unfavorably without over-evaluating themselves or under-evaluating blacks since the publically accepted evaluation dimension was defined with these differential valuations.

In the 1960's an increase in black pride has been documented (Attenborough & Zdep, 1972; Hraba & Grant, 1970). Once the black group has acquired a sense of pride, blacks now feel under-evaluated by the same traditional unfavorable evaluations of the black group by whites which previously did not under-evaluate them. The black evaluation of whites goes down as blacks see they have been and are being under-evaluated by whites. The white group maintains its traditional high self-evaluation which appears unjustified to blacks now that their opinion of the white group has gone down. Blacks now see whites as over-evaluating themselves as well as under-evaluating blacks. Similarly, whites feel blacks are over-evaluating themselves with

their new sense of pride, and under-evaluating whites with their newly developed hostility toward the white group. In other words, a unilateral acceptance of self-pride by the black group can initiate interracial hostility in which both blacks and whites feel the other group is over-evaluating itself and under-evaluating them. Studies of recent black protesters (black militants, riot participants, and student activists) show protesters have strong feelings of racial pride and feelings of personal ability to control their own lives coupled with the feeling that discrimination keeps blacks in a disadvantaged social position (Caplan, 1970; Caplan & Paige, 1968; Forward & Williams, 1970; Hillird, 1970; Marx, 1967). The protesters feel under-evaluated and blocked from receiving opportunities they deserve. They deserve more now with their new sense of pride than they felt they deserved previously .

Creating a sense of abundance in the exchange of interpersonal and economic resources by adhering to the positive equality norm might help alleviate the kind of interracial hostility just described.

REFERENCES

Attenborough, R. E., & Zdep, S. Self image among a national probability sample of girls. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, August, 1973.

Baron, R. A. Aggression as a function of magnitude of victim's pain cues, level of prior anger arousal, and aggressor-victom similarity. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 18, 48-54.

Byrne, D., & Griffitt, W. Similarity versus liking: A clarification. Psychonomic Science, 1966, 6, 295-296.

Caplan, N. The new ghetto man: A review of recent empirical studies. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26, 59-73.

Calpan, N., & Paige, J. M. A study of ghetto rioters. Scientific American, August 1968, 219(2), 15-21.

Deutsch, M., & Solomon, L. Reactions to evaluations by others as influenced by self-evaluations. Sociometry, 1959, 22, 93-112.

Eagly, A. H. Involvement as a determinant of response to favorable and unfavorable information. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 7 (3, Whole No. 643).

Eagly, A. H., & Acksen, B. The effect of expecting to be evaluated on change toward favorable and unfavorable information about oneself. Sociometry, 1971, 34, 411-422.

Felker, D. W. Improving the self-esteem of innter-city children. Colloquium address on a Purdue University research project, August 1972.

Foa, U. G. Convergencies in the analysis of the structure of interpersonal behavior. Psychological Review, 1961, 68, 341-353.

Foa, U. G. Interpersonal and economic resources. Science, 1971, 171, 345-351.

Forward, J., & Williams, J. Internal-external control and black militancy. Journal of Social Issues, 1970, 26, 75-92.

Geen, R. Effects of frustration, attack, and prior training in aggressiveness upon aggressive behavior. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 9, 316-321.

Harris, T. A. I'm OK-You're OK: A practical guide to transactional analysis. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Hart, R. J., & Warnick, D. How similarity determines interpersonal attraction: A resource scarcity analysis. In R. Pellegrini (Chm.), Contemporary approaches to the study of interpersonal evaluation. Symposium presented at the meeting of the Western Psychological Association, San Francisco, April 1974.

Harvey, O. J., Kelley, H.H., & Shapiro, M. M. Reactions to unfavorable evaluations of the self made by other persons. Journal of Personality, 1957, 25, 393-411.

Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

Hendrick, C., & Taylor, S. P. Effects of belief similarity and aggression on attraction and counteraggression. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 17, 342-349.

Hilliard, T. O. Personality characteristics of black student activists and nonactivisits. In Reginald Jones (Ed.), Black psychology. New York: Harper & Row, 1972.

Holmes, R. The university seminar and the primal horde: A study of formal behavior. British Journal of Sociology, 1967, 18, 135-150.

Hraba, J., & Grant, C. A reexamination of social preferences and identification. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1970, 16, 398-402.

Jones, S. C., & Pines, H. A. Self-revealing events and interpersonal evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1968, 8, 277-281.

Jones, S. C., & Ratner, C. Commitment to self-appraisal and interpersonal evaluations. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 6, 442-447.

Kuusinen, J. Affective and denotative structures of personality ratings. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1969, 12, 181-188.

Lerner, M. J., & Mathews, G. Reactions to suffering of others under conditions of indirect responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1967, 5, 319-325.

Marx, G. T. Protest and prejudice: A study of belief in the black community. New York: Harper & Row, 1967.

Osgood, C. E., Suci, G. J., & Tannenbaum, P. H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1957.

Pepitone, A. Attraction & Hostility: An experimental analysis of interpersonal and self-evaluation. New York: Atherton Press, 1964.

Pisano, R., & Taylor, S. P. Reduction of physical aggression: The effects of four strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1971, 19, 237-242.

Rogers, C. R. On becoming a person. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.

Ross, M., Thibaut, J., & Evenbeck, S. Some determinants of the intensity of social protest. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1971, 7, 401-418.

Shaw, M. E., & Breed, G. R. Effects of attribution of responsibility for negative events on behavior in small groups. Sociometry, 1970, 33, 382-393.

Shaw, M. E., & Sulzer, J. L. An empirical test of Heider's levels in attribution of responsibility. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1964, 69, 39-46.

Shaw, M. E., & Tremble, T. R. Effects of attribution of responsibility for a negative event ot a group member upon group process as a function of the structure of the event. Sociometry, 1971, 34, 504-514.

Steiner, I. D. Reactions to adverse and favorable evaluations of one's self. Journal of Personality, 1968, 36, 553-563.

Taylor, S. P. Aggressive behavior and physiological arousal as a function of provocation and the tendency to inhibit aggression. Journal of Personality, 1967, 35, 297-310.

Vaughan, G. M., & Corballis, M. C. Beyond tests of significance: Estimating strength of effects in selected anova designs. Psychological Bulletin, 1969, 72, 204-213.

Walster, E., Walster, B., Abrahams, D., & Brown, Z. The effect on liking of underrating or overrating another. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1966, 2, 70-84.

Wiest, W. W. A quantitative extention of Heider's theory of cognitive balance applied to interpersonal perception and self-esteem. Psychological Monographs, 1965, 79(14, Whole No. 607).

TABLE 1

Factor Analysis[a] of Dependent Variable Ratings of the Partner

Variables	Factors I	Factors II	h^2
1. Kind - Unkind	.83	.07	.70
2. Unselfish - Selfish	.78	.01	.60
3. Tolerant - Intolerant	.76	.04	.57
4. Just - Unjust	.66	.04	.44
5. Polite - Impolite	.80	.08	.65
6. Moral - Immoral	.65	.08	.43
7. Nice - Not nice (E)[b]	.85	.14	.74
8. Enjoy - Dislike working together 2nd Exp.	.71	.19	.53
9. Like - Dislike partner	.73	.19	.57
10. Pleasant - Unpleasant (E)	.78	.23	.67
11. Intelligent - Not intelligent	.57	.32	.43
12. Good - Bad (E)	.77	.33	.70

TABLE 1
(continued)

Variables	Factors I	Factors II	h^2
13. Dominant - Submissive	.15	.63	.42
14. Confident - Unconfident	.05	.53	.28
15. Active - Passive (A)	.04	.75	.57
16. Powerful - Powerless (P)	.04	.67	.45
17. Sturdy - Delicate (P)	.09	.58	.42
18. Strong - Weak (P)	.23	.58	.39
19. Ambitious - Unambitious	.24	.62	.44
20. Superior - Inferior	.51	.50	.51
21. Agile - Clumsy (A)	.45	.49	.44
22. Flexible - Rigid (A)	.36	.03	.14
23. Average Shock (trials 2-10)	.22	.16	.08
24. Preference to work alone or together	.21	.35	.17
25. Enjoy - Dislike vacation together	.44	.21	.24
Total Explained Variance	.31	.15	.46

[a]Principle factor solution with varimax rotation of factors was used.

[b]E, A, P, = Evaluation, Activity and Potency semantic differential items.

TABLE 2

Self-partner X Norm Means[a] and Simple Effects on Attribution of Responsibility for Disagreement

Person	Self-Seeker	Alienated	Underdog	Norm *F* ratios
Self	5.5	4.3	4.3	2.58
Partner	3.2	4.1	4.8	5.15*
Self-partner *F* ratios	26.00**	<1	<1	

[a] 1 = highly responsible, 10 = not responsible at all

* $p < .01$

** $p < .001$